

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/722,648	11/25/2003	Frank L. Rees	Greene-P1-03	7313	
28710 75	90 05/19/2006		EXAMINER		
PETER K. TRZYNA, ESQ. P O BOX 7131			LOBO,	LOBO, IAN J	
CHICAGO, IL 60680			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			3662		
		DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/722,648	REES, FRANK L.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	lan J. Lobo	3662			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Fee 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-117 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-60,62,63 and 66-11 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 61,64 and 65 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	1 <u>7</u> is/are withdrawn from consider	ation.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original transfer access and the correction of the co	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/26/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/722,648 Page 2

Art Unit: 3662

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1, 61, and 64-66 in the replies filed on October 31, 2005 and February 21, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that (a) the examiner has not given any reasons or information, required under 35 USC Sec. 132, (b) the office does not contend that the species is separate and distinct, (c) the office action does not contend that any of the sub-species is separate and distinct and has separate utility, (d) there is no serious burden on the examiner, and (e) applicants have added linking claims 116 and 117 which are believed, by applicant, to be generic. This is not found persuasive because the arguments (a-c) are directed to restriction practice. An election of species is not the same as restriction practice. See MPEP 806.04. With respect to argument (d), the very fact that the invention has five embodiments with sub-species in each is indicia of a serious burden. Finally, claims 116 and 117 are withdrawn since they are not linking claims and further not generic (See MPEP 806.04).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/722,648 Page 3

Art Unit: 3662

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sen et al ('081) or Grall et al ('007) when taken in view of the Rees patent ('760).

Per claim 1, the patents to Sen et al and Grall et al each discloses a method of identifying an object using nonlinear acoustics.

The difference between claim 1 and the Sen et al and Grall et al systems is the instant claim specifies producing the nonlinear acoustic effect by "using multiple projectors driven by a synthetic spectrum".

The patent to Rees (see col. 15, line 58 – col. 16, line 4) teaches increased acoustic enhancement by transmitting a synthetic spectrum waveform using a multiple set of phase locked, pulsed acoustic carrier waveforms each emitted form individual projectors.

In view of the increased acoustic enhancement, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sen et al or Grall et al producing of the non-linear acoustic effect by transmitting a synthetic spectrum waveform using multiple projectors.

Claim 1 is so rejected.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 61, 64 and 65 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/722,648 Page 4

Art Unit: 3662

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ian J. Lobo whose telephone number is (571) 272-6974. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas H. Tarcza can be reached on (571) 272-6979. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lan J. Lobo Primary Examiner Art Unit 3662